

A N
Impartial EXAMINATION *K*
OF A *1027.2.17*
PAMPHLET,

INTITLED,
*Considerations on several Proposals lately
made for the better Maintenance of the Poor:*

WITH
Some Serious and Occasional
ANIMADVERSIONS

ON THIS
Important SUBJECT.

To which are annexed,
COPIES of the *Considerations*;
And of another PAMPHLET, intitled,
REMARKS *on the Laws relating to the Poor.*

Magna est Veritas, et praevalabit.

L O N D O N:
Printed in the YEAR M D C C L I I.





P R E F A C E.

HAVING often and carefully read over a Pamphlet, intituled, Considerations on several Proposals lately made for the better Maintenance of the Poor; I have not been able at all to determine, whether the Author has been serious in his Performance, or only intended to amuse and mislead the Reader. Could any one imagine, when in his Second Page he compliments the supposed Author of the Remarks on the Laws relating to the Poor, that at the same time he was attacking and undermining that whole Piece? professing the Performance to be valuable; and yet straining several particular Expressions, and wresting them to a Sense, they are incapable of bearing? This unfair Method tends necessarily to the Abuse

A 2

and

and Prejudicing of every one, that is unacquainted with the Remarks; and even of many, who, having but cursorily perused them, cannot see how much they are imposed upon by his Misrepresentations. The Author, if he had had any Desire of appearing candid, ought particularly to have pointed out, in his First Page, whom he there means by some few Writers. But this Proceeding would have laid him under a Necessity of answering and disproving what the REMARKER has (a) advanced in Support of his Proposition; namely, that the Laws relating to the Poor, are so defective, as to prevent the desirable End for which they were ordained. This, probably from a Consciousness of his Inability to effect it, he has very artfully evaded.

In order to rescue that (b) GOOD MAN (the Author of the Remarks) from this ill Usage, the Whole of that Pamphlet, except a few Pages, is here reprinted; the Reason for omitting of which may be seen in the Copy. Not that I would be understood to approve of every Part of his Schemes; so far from

(a) See the Remarks, from Page 7 to 14.

(b) See Foster's Characters of a Righteous and a Good Man, Vol. I. p. 25.

P R E F A C E.

it, I shall venture to differ from him in some Particulars; and assign the Reasons for that Difference.

And the EXAMINER thinks it not improper, in this Place, to declare, that though he is at no Loss to guess at the Author, he is an entire Stranger to his Person; and that what demands his Approbation and Esteem, is the disinterested Regard to the Publick, and the tender and benevolent Disposition towards the Poor, which discovers itself in his unwearied and repeated Endeavours to promote their Relief and Employ.

As the CONSIDERER is vague and loose, and in many Places unintelligible and inconsistent; it was likewise necessary to annex a Copy at large of that Pamphlet; so that the impartial Reader may the better judge of his Performance, and these Observations.

What Inducements this Writer has had to treat this important Subject in so unbecoming a manner, is hard to conclude. We will not pronounce it to have proceeded from private Friendship; it surely could not arise from the Love of his Country. Perhaps, he is of that kind of Disputants, mentioned by Dean Swift, whose whole Delight,

like that of a true Sportsman, is in the Pursuit; and he no more cares for the Truth, than the other for the Hare.

It is hoped the Reader will excuse my having omitted to take any Notice of some few Paragraphs in that Pamphlet, and having enlarged no more upon some others; when he reflects, that, in order to have them seasonable and serviceable, but a very short time could be allowed for throwing together these few Thoughts; and when he is likewise informed, that the Author is at the same time, and has been very much of late, confined by a severe Fit of Illness.





AN IMPARTIAL
EXAMINATION, &c.



THE Author of the *Considerations*, &c. in his Preface, seems to agree with the Generality, in allowing the Justness of the Complaint, that "the Expences in maintaining the Poor are great: That the Money raised for that Purpose is ill managed: That the Poor are, in many Places, still badly provided for; and the Publick deprived of the inestimable Value of their Labour." He also observes, "there is now a greater Degree of true Publick Spirit happily rising among us, and more Attention paid, than formerly, to Matters upon which the real Welfare of the Nation depends." Yet, for all this, he applies all his Wit and Cunning to obstruct the Success of that Spirit, he so highly commends. This will be sufficiently proved in its proper Place. He then would endeavour to spirit up the Landed Gentlemen more diligently to turn their Thoughts towards a

right Employment of the Poor, and to give a little of their Time to such Matters; it being for their Interest as much as for their Honour, heartily to engage in the good Government of the People; as well to see that the Poor are rightly employed, and well provided for, as to rescue themselves from the *Dutch* Reproach, That a Gentleman and an Idleman are synonymous Terms. And further, to enforce this, he ascribes to the Neglect of this Duty, the great Cause of the Evil complained of. "For (says he) "if the whole Care of the Poor be put "upon Persons, who have neither Time, Capacity, "Authority, nor (as to many of them) sufficient "Integrity, for the Purpose; you may make "what Laws you will, they will never answer "the End."

From this pompous Preparation we are led to expect something more important and effectual, than what the Author here descends to: It might be expected, that the Labour of the Poor should be no longer lost, and they better maintained; but, alas! he contents himself with only saying, "Must Gentlemen then be Overseers of the Poor, and Parish-Officers? No, says he, they must interest themselves in the appointing proper Officers; in the "inspecting their Behaviour, and their Accounts; "and in enjoining and enabling them to set up "Workhouses." As to the appointing proper Officers, and inspecting their Accounts, it is to be presumed that most Gentlemen, who reside in the Country, already engage themselves so far: And those who do not, there is little Reason to suppose they will exert themselves more hereafter (notwithstanding all he has said) than they have hitherto done. As to the other Part of his Proposal, which relates to the Erecting of Workhouses, and the

6

Employ-

Employment of the Poor ; under the present Parochial Limitations, the End proposed cannot be answered, because in many Parishes the Proposal cannot be carried into Execution : As is fully explained by the Resolutions of the House of Commons, the 13th of *June* last ; where it is declared to be the Opinion of that Honourable House (c), “ That
 “ many Parishes are too small separately to raise a
 “ Stock, sufficient wherewith to employ the
 “ Poor, to any Advantage.”

As to his Assertions, that “ the great Cause of the
 “ Evil complained of, has been wrongfully ascribed
 “ to a Defect in the Laws ; and that make what
 “ Laws you will, they will never answer the End,
 “ if the whole Care of the Poor be put upon Persons, who have neither Time, Capacity, Authority, nor (as to many of them) sufficient Integrity, for the Purpose ;” this is, in truth, the grand Question under Consideration : It is proper therefore to examine the Premises themselves, before the Justness of his Conclusion drawn from them can be admitted ; and we shall see, that the Complaints have been *justly* ascribed to a Defect in the Laws ; and that Laws may be enacted which *will* answer the End. Nay, the Author seems to own the Force of this Argument, as is evident from his own Words. “ It may be presumed (says he) from the
 “ present Spirit of Benevolence and Charity among
 “ the People of *Britain*, that mere Indolence
 “ among the Men of Fortune is not the chief
 “ Cause that counteracts their natural Humanity,
 “ and prevents their engaging in the good Work
 “ proposed. May it not rather (he asks) be ascribed to their thinking it would be to no purpose for them to act, and that it is out of their

(c) See *Considerations*, &c. page 26.

“ Power to do any Good under the present Laws,
 “ which are said not only to be ill executed, but
 “ wrong in their Foundation, and not capable of
 “ being put into serviceable Practice ?”

Before we take Leave of his Preface, it may not be amiss to observe, That in the last Paragraph, the Author acquaints us, “ the Business of his following Papers is to shew, that the Laws now subsisting relating to the Poor, are fundamentally good ; and, with such small Improvements and Alterations, as the Change of Times and Circumstances makes necessary, will effectually answer the excellent Purposes designed ; provided that Persons of Rank and Substance will give some Countenance and Authority towards their Support.” Now it is not possible to find out, upon the most careful Examination, how or where the Author has performed his Engagements ; or, where he has suggested those necessary Alterations, which the Change of Times and Circumstances requires ; or, indeed, how Persons of Rank and Substance are to be obliged to give Countenance and Authority towards the Support of the Laws.

Nor must it be omitted, that, notwithstanding his Objections to the Hands on whom the Care of the Poor at present rests, and his Complaint that the Publick are deprived of the inestimable Value of their Labour ; it no-where, appears that he has proposed any rational Scheme for the Remedying of either.

Having thus examined the Preface, we now proceed to take a View of the Book itself.

The CONSIDERER, at his first setting out, having mentioned the 43d of Queen *Elizabeth*, and distinguished it in *Italicks*, as a Statute for maintaining

taining and employing the Poor; lest the Reader should thereby be led into an Opinion, that this is the real Title of the Act, we are called upon to inform him, that the 43d of Queen *Elizabeth* is intitled, *An Act for the Relief of the Poor*. Whether this Mistake of the Author was owing to Ignorance or Intention, we leave others to judge.

Instead of proceeding to the Proof of his Proposition, That *the Laws in being are fundamentally good*, &c. the CONSIDERER flies off to the Attack of the *Remarks*, &c. (though he has not been so generous as to confess it) in which the Author having lamented the ill Success of a Bill for the better Relief of the Poor, by voluntary Charities, which passed the House of Commons in 1747. he says, (d) "He is almost convinced, that, if all the present Laws relating to the Poor were abolished, and a Law were to subsist for the Relief of the Poor by voluntary Charities, it would be an adequate Provision; and that, in no long Space of Time, a Rate for the Poor would be as unnecessary as it was before the Reformation."

Now we appeal to the Reader, to determine whether, from the Passage here quoted, the CONSIDERER had sufficient Reasons for so positive an Assertion, as that (e) *some few Writers have been so much offended at the Laws in being, that they have expressed a Desire to have them all abolished, and the Poor left to random Charity*. For surely it is one thing to declare an Opinion, and another to express a Desire. And, besides, the Bill proposed was to be regarded only as an Aid to the established Laws; as it did not meddle with any Law now in being, nor

(d) See Preface to the *Remarks*, page viii.

(e) See *Considerations*, page 1.

make the least Alteration in any one Thing at present established (f).

And on this false Bottom he builds the several succeeding Paragraphs ; but, having destroyed the Foundation, the Superstructure falls of Course.

He (g) then proceeds to what is entirely foreign to the Purpose ; because, as our Expectations are built on the Resolutions of *June 1751*. we should wait to see what Laws may be proposed in consequence of those Resolutions : We have no Authority to conclude, that what is recommended by Judge *Hale*, Sir *Josiah Child*, or any others, is to be the Result of the Resolutions of 1751. ; and it had been time enough to have objected, when such Bills had been brought in. Whereas, to anticipate the Determination of the Legislature is a Liberty, one would imagine, not very safe ; at least it is a Behaviour not very decent.

(b) After this, how absurd is he in his Notions, and false in his Assertions, when he would lead us into an Opinion, that a greater Likelihood of the parochial Institution's succeeding, may be made appear even from the Reason of Things ! How absurd, I say, as well as false, is he, when the long Experience of so many Years has indisputably evinced the contrary ! If the present Establishment is so sufficient, why has it hitherto failed of Success ? From Means so effectual, why is not the End obtained ? If the Provision is so competent, why are the Poor still destitute both of Maintenance and Employ ? The Cause remaining, will the Effects be altered ? And, the Laws continuing the same, how

(f) See Preface to the *Remarks*, page viii.

(g) See *Considerations*, page 2.

(b) *Ibid*.

can we expect the Benefits will be greater? The Reasonableness of which Reflections is so obvious, that they did not escape the Notice even of the CONSIDERER.

And they likewise coincide with the Sentiments of Sir *Josiah Child*; whose Arguments it would have been more incumbent on the CONSIDERER to have confuted, and have removed the Objections raised by that Author to the Laws in being, ere he had attempted to oppose and condemn any subsequent Scheme.

The valuable Discourse of Sir *Josiah Child* is now before me; and his manner of treating this Subject is so masterly, and so very apposite to the present Case, that I need make no Apology for transcribing from it a Page or Two.

(i) "How comes it to pass (he asks) that in
" *England* we do not, nor ever did, comfortably
" maintain and employ our Poor?

"The common Answers to this Question (he
" says) are Two.

"1. That our Laws to this Purpose are as good
" as any in the World; but we fail in the Execu-
" tion.

"2. That formerly, in the Days of our pious
" Ancestors, the Work was done; but now Cha-
" rity is decreased: And that is the Reason we see
" the Poor so neglected as now they are.

"In both which Answers (I humbly conceive)
" the Effect is mistaken for the Cause: For though
" it cannot be denied, but there hath been, and is,
" a great Failure in the Execution of those Statutes
" which relate to the Poor; yet, I say, the Cause

(i) See the 82d and following Pages of Sir *Josiah Child*'s Discourse of *Trade*, &c. printed 1698.

" of

“ of that Failure hath been occasioned by Defect
 “ of the Laws themselves.

“ For otherwise what is the Reason, that, in our
 “ late times of Confusion and Alteration, wherein
 “ almost every Party in the Nation, at one time or
 “ other, took their Turn at the Helm, and all had
 “ that Compass (those Laws) to steer by, and yet
 “ none of them could, or ever did, conduct the
 “ the Poor into a Harbour of Security to them, and
 “ Profit to the Kingdom? *i. e.* None sufficiently
 “ maintained the Impotent, and employed the In-
 “ digent amongst us: And if this was never done
 “ in any Age, nor by any Sort of Men whatsoever
 “ in this Kingdom, who had the Use of those Laws
 “ now in Force, it seems to me a very strong Ar-
 “ gument, that it never could, nor ever will be done
 “ by those Laws; and that consequently the De-
 “ fect lies in the Laws themselves, not in the Men;
 “ *i. e.* those that should put them in Execution.

“ As to the Second Answer to the aforesaid Que-
 “ stion, wherein *want of Charity* is assigned for
 “ another Cause, why the Poor are now so much
 “ neglected, I think it is a scandalous ungrounded
 “ Accusation of our Contemporaries: For most that
 “ I converse with, are not so much troubled to part
 “ with their Money, as how to place it, that it may
 “ do Good, and not Hurt, to the Kingdom: For
 “ if they give to the Beggars in the Streets, or at
 “ their Doors, they fear they may do Hurt, by
 “ encouraging that lazy unprofitable kind of Life:
 “ And if they give more than their Proportions in
 “ their respective Parishes, that (they say) is but
 “ giving to the Rich; for the Poor are not set on
 “ Work thereby, nor have the more given them;
 “ but only their rich Neighbours pay the less.

“ I write not this (says he) to divert any Man
 “ from Works of Charity of any Kind: He that
 “ gives to any in Want does well; but he that gives
 “ to employ and educate the Poor, so as to render
 “ them useful to the Kingdom, in my Judgment,
 “ does better.

“ The Second Question then is, Wherein lies the
 “ Defect of our present Laws relating to the
 “ Poor?

“ I answer, That there may be many; but I
 “ shall here take notice of One only, which I think
 “ to be fundamental, and which until altered, the
 “ Poor in *England* can never be well provided for,
 “ or employed; and that when the said funda-
 “ mental Error is well mended, it is almost impos-
 “ sible they should lack either Work or Mainte-
 “ nance.

“ The said radical Error I esteem to be the
 “ leaving it to the Care of every Parish to main-
 “ tain their own Poor only; upon which follows
 “ the shifting off, sending or whipping back the poor
 “ Wanderers to the Place of their Birth, or last
 “ Abode; the Practice whereof I have seen many
 “ Years, in *London*, to signify as much as ever it
 “ will, which is just nothing of Good to the King-
 “ dom in general, or the Poor thereof; though it
 “ be sometimes, by Accident, to some of them, a
 “ Punishment without Effect; I say without Ef-
 “ fect, because it reforms not the Party, nor dis-
 “ poses the Minds of others to Obedience; which
 “ are the true Ends of all Punishment.

“ If it be here retorted upon me, that, by my
 “ own Confession, much of this Mischief happens
 “ by the non, or ill, Execution of the Laws; I
 “ say, Better Execution than you have seen, you
 “ must

“ must not expect ; and there was never a good
 “ Law made that was not well executed ; the Fault
 “ of the Law causing a Failure of Execution.”

The Author of the *Remarks*, &c. having made such large Quotations from the Lord Chief Justice *Hale*, I shall extract but little from him ; yet I cannot however omit what he says in his Preface ; viz.

“ A due Care for the Relief of the Poor is an
 “ Act ;

“ 1. Of great Piety towards Almighty God, who
 “ requires it of us.

“ 2. It is an Act of greatest Humanity among
 “ Men. Mercy and Benignity is due to the very
 “ Beasts that serve us ; much more to those that
 “ are Partakers of the same common Nature with
 “ us.

“ 3. It is an Act of great civil Prudence, and
 “ political Wisdom.”

He afterwards closes his Preface with declaring, That he shall consider, principally, these things :

“ 1. What Provisions there are already settled
 “ by the Laws, in Force, for the Relief and Em-
 “ ployment of the Poor.

2. Wherein the Defects are, in relation to those
 “ Laws or Provisions ; and the Consequences there-
 “ of.

“ 3. What may be thought a convenient Supply
 “ of those Defects ; and the Consequences of such
 “ Supplies.”

For the Discussion of these Three Heads, I refer the Reader to his Discourse touching Provision for the Poor (*k*).

Having

(*k*) See Page 113 of Sir *Matthew Hale's* Discourse touching Provision for the Poor ; bound up with his *Pleas of the Crown* ; printed 1716.

Having selected these several Passages from the afore-mentioned Works, the CONSIDERER will find it necessary to disprove the many and strong Arguments which in them, and in the *Remarks* from Page 7. to 13. so forcibly make against him, before he can expect from the Publick any Attention to his wild and visionary Schemes, or any Approbation of his Piece: For, at present, instead of proving by Argument, he amuses only with bare Assertions; and if an *Ipse dixit* is to be admitted for fair Reasoning, his Performance is most instructive, rational, and convincing.

It is to be wished the CONSIDERER would explain what he means by the Term SUBORDINATE; it being certainly against Truth, to affix that Epithet to parochial Divisions; which, under the present Establishment, are all distinct Districts, detached from each other, and dependent upon none. Perhaps he secretly approves of the Proposal he would seem to oppose; and would here recommend the erecting several Workhouses for the Poor, and having them all subordinate to their own Counties.

In order to strengthen his Assertion concerning the Reasonableness of the established Provision, he asserts, (1) we have lived under it near Two Centuries.

The Author here is much mistaken in his Calculation; for, from the Enacting of the 43^d of Queen *Elizabeth*, to the Publication of his Pamphlet, there are no more than 150 Years: And he would do well to consider, that the Law subsisted only between 60 and 70 Years before it was found deficient: That upwards of 80 Years it has been

(1) See *Considerations*, &c. page 3.

impeached, and Proposals made for enlarging the Districts.

With what Authority then can he advance, that the Proposal of enlarging the Districts, is *new* and *unusual*, and *not founded in Reason*; when both the Impeachment and Proposal are evidently as old as the Times of Sir *Josiah Child* and Lord Chief Justice *Hale*, whose Judgments may be surely esteemed not inferior to that of the CONSIDERER?

When he commends the *(m)* *Thrift* and *Frugality* of the Parish-Officers, he surely forgot, that a little before, in his Preface, he had supposed, that *(n)* the whole Care of the Poor might be put upon Persons who have neither Time, Capacity, Authority, nor (as to many of them) sufficient Integrity for the Purpose.

The next *(o)* Paragraph presents us with a Suggestion of the Author, which he would assign as a Reason, why, after the Representations of Judge *Hale*, Sir *Josiah Child*, &c. and the Resolutions of the House of Commons in 1735. nothing was done in pursuance of them. Now, it does not appear to me, that this Business was ever under the Consideration of the House of Commons till the Year 1735; and why it then failed of Success, is very fully accounted for in the Preface to the *Remarks*.

(p) After enumerating, in the same Page, many imaginary Difficulties, he concludes with an unbecoming Reflection on the Gentlemen that favour and espouse what he calls the new Scheme: And, with no small Degree of Self-sufficiency, he imputes

(m) See *Considerations*, &c. page 4.

(n) See Preface to the *Considerations*, &c. page iv.

(o) See *Considerations*, &c. page 4.

(p) *Ibid.*

the Proposal of such a Scheme to their Neglect of the Care of the Poor, and their Unacquaintance with the practical Object.

This, surely, is taking from the Merits of those great and worthy Men, who have proposed the Alteration, only to arrogate a larger Share to himself. It is insinuating, that his own Knowledge of, and Attention to, these Matters, has saved him from joining with them, in the entertaining a Thought of a Scheme, that must be attended, as he suggests, with Inconveniencies so many and grievous.

But this Supposition is not more unbecoming than erroneous; because the Situation of the Favourers of the Scheme has not removed them from the practical Object: And it is from their thorough Insight into the Defects of the present Laws, that they have laid the Blame in the *right* Place.

If Self-experience has any Weight; the Author of these Examinations has been many Years, in the Commission of the Peace for the Counties of *Middlesex*, *Surry*, and *Kent*, and has been ever of his present Opinion; because he has frequently been Witness to the Insufficiency of the Laws, with regard both to the Maintenance and Employ of the Poor.

He has often seen the Poor applying for an Increase of their weekly Allowance from the Parish-Officers; and though an Addition has been made by Order of Justices (as far as the great Charge of the Poores Rate would permit them), yet, even then, considering their Circumstances and Numbers in Family, it has been too scanty for their Support.

He has known miserable Wretches, who, though so spent with Illness, as not fit to be removed from a Bed, have yet been harassed about from Justice to

Justice, in order only to the Signing an Order for their Removal. Another distressful and cruel Consequence of parochial Settlements, and the present Method of Removals !

But these Hardships the CONSIDERER believes are unknown to the Generality ; and tho' they possibly could not escape his Penetration, yet he would exert his utmost to prevent their Redress.

(q) In the succeeding Paragraph we meet with an Assertion as wrong as the foregoing : He tells us, that the INDUSTRIOUS POOR seem to be *quite forgot* ; their Names are never mentioned, nor their Interest thought of, in any of the new Schemes. He seems to be entirely unacquainted with the Sentiments of Sir *Josiah Child*, who, in speaking of the Advantage to the Kingdom in general, and to the Poor in particular, that will accrue by a Society of Men (he had been proposing to establish) more than is enjoined by the Laws at present, observes,

(r) " That the Assembly will doubtless appoint
" some of their own Members to visit and relieve
" such as are sick, as often as there shall be Occa-
" sion, together with poor labouring Families (which
" *must* mean the Industrious) both in City and Sub-
" urbs."

And besides—since he has already acknowledged the *Remarks*, &c. to be a valuable Performance, and from many strong Allusions, particularly in the Case of the (s) *Bristol* Scheme, it appears, he must be thoroughly acquainted with them, how can he justify himself in asserting what is so directly contrary to some distinguishing Passages in that Pamphlet ?

(q) See *Considerations*, page 5.

(r) See the 96th Page of Sir *Josiah Child's* Discourse on *Trade*, printed 1698.

(s) See *Considerations*, &c. page 17. and 18.

In his intended Provision for the Poor, the RE-MARKER pays the INDUSTRIOUS a particular Deference: (t) "As to those, he says, who are able to labour, 'tis reasonable to distinguish them according to their Merit, and separate the Innocent from the Guilty; therefore there should be a House of Correction, where Criminals should be confined to hard Labour, as well as a Workhouse for the rest of the Poor, who are honest and industrious." And again, (u) "The Third Building in each District is the Workhouse; a Place where all the honest and industrious Poor are to find Employment."

Nay, so far from neglecting, that the same Author proposes, the Corporation (w) "should have a Liberty (where they saw it convenient) to relieve or employ a poor Family, and suffer them to reside in any other Part of the District." Are the INDUSTRIOUS POOR then *quite forgot*? Where is there room for any Despondency? or how can they think they will *now no longer have a Home*?

The next Particular to be considered, is the Reason assigned, why (x) the Poor are better taken Care of, and all kinds of Complaints relating to them less, in the City of *London*, than in the Out-Parishes, and in *Westminster*. He informs us, it is because the Parishes in the City are smaller, and there are more Officers, and more Magistrates, who do their Duty there, than in the other Parts. It is allowed, that the Parishes in the City are small; and in Honour to the Magistracy it must be said, the

(t) See the *Remarks*, &c. page 37.

(u) *Ibid.* page 40.

(w) *Ibid.* page 42.

(x) See *Considerations*, &c. page 5, 6.

Officers do their Duty : But this is not all ; besides the Smallness of the Parishes, the Kind of Inhabitants is to be likewise considered ; who are, in general, Men of Wealth and Substance ; and, being much streightened for Room themselves, little or none is left for the Inhabitancy or Harbour of the lower Kind of People ; who are therefore necessarily obliged to reside in the Out-Parts, where the Parishes are more extensive, and the Rents easier.

Though it is confessedly true, that in some Parts of the City many Houses are untenanted ; yet they are every-where too high-rented to admit such Persons as can properly come under the Denomination of Poor, or the Harbourers of them.

(y) We must not pass over the high Terms he speaks in, of King *Alfred's* Days ; but, if we compare what he here says, with what he has observed in another Place, we shall not only find him a little inconsistent, but his Proposal idle and absurd,

(z) In Page 7. he speaks of the Excellence of Queen *Elizabeth's* Law, as a Step towards the old Method, which wrought the good Effect in King *Alfred's* time ; and yet (a) in Page 25. he tells us, that half the Lands were in that Queen's Reign a Forest, and many of the poorer Sort in them as wild and as useless as *Indians* : That Manufactures were in their Infancy ; and that she wanted to drive these wild People into Towns, where they might be employed in Trade, and not live in Huts like Highlanders.

Now, if this Picture be just, how much worse must we suppose would be the Description of the

(y) See *Considerations*, &c. page 6, 7, 8.

(z) *Ibid.* page 7.

(a) *Ibid.* page 25.

Inhabitants of this Island, so long before as the Days of *Alfred*? And if in the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth* such Instances of Rudeness and Barbarism are to be met with, it would be no great Happiness to return to that Estate, which was maintained so many Centuries preceding.

What follows concerning *(b) Switzerland* and *Holland*, is so obscure, that, until it is made intelligible, it cannot be answered.

As to the Polity of *(c) China* and *Japan*, in which the decennary Scheme, like that of King *Alfred*, is said to be in Use; it is to be wished the CONSIDERER would favour us with an Estimate of what the Salaries would amount to, of his *(d)* little Army of Officers to be appointed for the Care of the Poor of a whole County, carried into one Place, *(which is a Scheme of his own)*; and compare it with an Estimate of the Charge to be introduced by *his other (e) Scheme*, founded upon the Usage of the *Chinese, Japanese*, and our *Saxon* Ancestors.

But we must return back to examine the *(f)* Observations he makes on many other Faults found with our present Statutes.

(g) In Answer to what the CONSIDERER has advanced in the Matter, about Certificates, he must be referred to the *(h) Remarks*, where that Author has very fully and sufficiently spoke to this Point.

(b) See *Considerations*, &c. page 7.

(c) *Ibid.* page 8.

(d) *Ibid.* page 4.

(e) *Ibid.* from Page 12. to the latter End of Page 16.

(f) *Ibid.* page 8.

(g) *Ibid.* page 9.

(h) See the *Remarks*, &c. from Page 8. to the End of Page 9.

The next thing he would endeavour to support, is, the (i) Law-suits about Appeals: And, in order to it, he represents the Expence and Trouble to be much less than they are generally imagined. But how delusive, and ill-grounded, his Representations are, may be clearly seen from the aforesaid *Remarks* (k).

And the CONSIDERER is called upon to declare by what Authority he can say, (l) "'tis to be questioned, whether any One Parish in *England* had not rather the Laws should continue as they are, than be barred of the Right of Appeal against the Order of any Two Justices whatsoever." He is called upon, I say, to declare what Authority he has for this Assertion; when it is notorious, that the Right of Appeal does not lie in the Parish, but only in the Parish-Officers; and, through their Ignorance or Partiality, they often take such Steps as draw on large and unforeseen Expences.

In the Preface to a Collection of Statutes at large, concerning the Provision for the Poor, it is justly observed, that "the (m) Parish-Officers in *England*, being generally deprived of the Knowledge of the Statutes relating to the Poor, have frequently committed great Mistakes in the Execution of their Offices, to the no small Damage of the Parish in general; and oftentimes, for want of knowing their Duty, have incurred severe Penalties, which has occasioned the Ruin of themselves and Families; and also the Poor have been deprived of that

(i) See *Considerations*, &c. page 9.

(k) See *Remarks*, page 10. and 11.

(l) See *Considerations*, &c. page 9.

(m) See Preface to the *Statutes at large*, concerning the Provision of the Poor.

“ necessary Support and Relief which the Laws
“ have provided for them.”

And on what frivolous Occasions great Sums have been expended, may be seen in a (n) Collection of Sessions Cases touching Settlements, adjudged in the Court of King's-Bench; and also from (o) *Foley's Laws relating to the Poor*, with Cases adjudged in the Court of King's-Bench, upon the several Causes of them.

The CONSIDERER likewise intimates, that the Lawyers begin to cry out for want of Work, and wish for a new Act, which always brings fresh Trade. It is allowed, that a new Act, which only amends and explains any others in being, will very probably bring along with it sufficient Trade: But if the Laws relating to the Poor were reduced into One, it surely might be made so explicit as to leave little Room for Disputes, especially if it abolished parochial Interests.

The 11th Page (p) of the *Considerations* is taken up in exposing the mischievous Effects of a Scheme to provide for the Poor of a whole County in One Place. Now it can be made appear, that the CONSIDERER, not in this Place only, but through the Whole of his Pamphlet, has raised a Bugbear to frighten his Reader; that he has erected an imaginary Castle, only to shew how dextrously he can attack, and successfully demolish it.

The Scheme of (q) Sir *Josiah Child* comprehends the Cities of *London*, *Westminster*, the Borough of *Southwark*, and all Places within the Bills of Mor-

(n) See *Sessions Cases adjudged in the Court of King's-Bench*.

(o) See *Foley's Laws relating to the Poor*.

(p) See *Considerations*, &c. page 11.

(q) See Sir *Josiah Child*, page 90, 91.

talities; which must indeed be looked upon as a large PROVINCE: But if we reflect upon the time when that Author wrote, and the prodigious Increase of Buildings, that have been since added on all Sides; the PROVINCE was not so large when his Proposal was made, as it now appears: And it is plain, that great Man had in View the erecting within that PROVINCE *several* Workhouses, Hospitals, and Houses of Correction.

As to the Proposals recommended by Lord Chief Justice (r) *Hale*, and others mentioned in the *Remarks*, they are so far from including whole Counties, that they were all confined to much smaller Divisions: As the REMARKER very justly observes, that they all agree in these fundamental Points (s), "That the Care of the Poor ought not to be left
" any longer to each Parish; but that every County
" should be divided into larger Districts for that
" Purpose," &c. And to take the Sense of the Author of the *Remarks*, who very justly says, Page 35. (t) "None of these Authors have pretended to determine the Extent of these Districts, which is best left to the Wisdom of Parliament."

And that there was no determined Intention of providing for the Poor of a whole County in One Place, is evident as well from the (u) Resolutions of the House of Commons, in 1735. as from the Substance of a Bill brought in, in 1736. in pursuance of those Resolutions.

(r) See the *Remarks*, &c. pages 26. and 31.

(s) *Ibid.* page 34.

(t) *Ibid.* page 35.

(u) *Ibid.* page 58.

(w) In which Bill it was referred to the Justices at Quarter-Sessions, to lay out the Counties into what Districts they thought proper.

(x) Although, at the End of the Page now before me, it is said to be a great Mistake to imagine, that the CONSIDERER has said all this in order to cry down the new proposed County-method, merely at the same time to raise and enforce the old one, in a manner he is about to hint; yet, I believe such a Suggestion would be his best Excuse, and save him from a worse Imputation.

To give us another Specimen of this Author's Inconsistency, it is entertaining enough to confront what he advances in the Midst of his wild Scheme with what he says in Page 23. He proposes in the former, that (y) the Justices of these Special Sessions should be allowed Half a Guinea a Day for their Expence; and yet, some time after, he can assert, that (z) Magistracy there must be; and to have it with any Effect, it must be made *respectable*.

The *Honour* of serving their Country in the Commission is sufficient to engage *proper Persons* to act; nor would they be influenced by the Proposal of *Profit*: They will disregard the *Loss* and *Expence* attending the Discharge of their Office; and thereby best prevent any Circumstances of *Disgrace* going along with it.

To pursue this Author through all his Absurdities is endless: However, a very considerable one, I think, remains still behind. After complaining that

(w) See the *Remarks*, &c. page 60.

(x) See *Considerations*, &c. page 11,

(y) *Ibid.* page 13.

(z) *Ibid.* page 23,

(a) many Gentlemen of Five hundred Pounds a Year Estate and upwards, are left out of the Commission of Peace ; he proposes it should be enacted, That every Gentleman so possessed might at any Assizes, when the Commission is read over, require his Name to be added ; exhibiting at the same time his Qualification, and acting at his Peril, if it proves a false one.

And this modest Proposal is introduced with a *Would there be any Harm ?* The Answer to which is very easy, That such a Proceeding would be neither decent nor safe.

It would be indecent ; because it would encroach upon the Royal Prerogative. The Crown is the Fountain of Honour ; and yet this Author here would provide for the Derivation of Honour merely from the bare Possession of an Estate.

Nor is it safe ; because by this Means the Power would be indiscriminately placed ; it would be lodged equally in Persons well affected and disaffected ; and no Establishment would be secure.

And his Motives to this Proposal are so trifling, that they are scarce worth mentioning—They were in order (b) that the Gentlemen in the Commission might be secure of having good Company ; or, at least, not to be deprived of the best, that each Neighbourhood affords. But can it be imagined, that Gentlemen, who have the Honour of his Majesty's Commission, would condescend to act with those who would thus forcibly obtrude themselves upon them ; often against the Interest, ever against the Inclinations, of the Government ? He might, with as much Modesty, have proposed, That for

(a) See *Considerations*, &c. page 24.

(b) *Ibid.*

the future it should not be in the Power of the Crown to issue out Commissions of the Peace; since he would thus effectually provide, that the Office of Justice of the Peace should be hereditary in any Family possessed of Five Hundred a Year. A most unbecoming and presumptive Proposal!

Having reviewed the most material Particulars that occur in the *Considerations*, with regard to the Maintenance and Employ of the Poor, it is high time to take leave of the Author, when he does of his Subject. But as he would endeavour to divert the Reader from the main Point, and place before him some very popular Objects, it will not be amiss to follow him in his Digressions, and see whether he is in them also equally just and candid.

From the Success of the (c) *Bristol* Scheme he insinuates, That it does not from thence follow, that a County Division is better than a Parochial one for the Kingdom in general: Which is a Conclusion by no means to be admitted: And the Author has himself suggested the Reasons. *Bristol* being a maritime City, full of Merchants, and considerable Men, who are generally more ready to give a little of their Time to publick Affairs than those who have nothing at all to do; and from whose Care, and prudent Management, the well and charitably disposed People were encouraged to become Benefactors, when with Pleasure they saw their Donations so well applied; and *Sudbury* and *Colchester* being Towns more thinly inhabited, and by those too, not so capable of conducting such an Affair; it is no more to be wondered at, that the very same Scheme should succeed in the one, and fail in the others, than that Oeconomy and ill Management should have different Effects. And it is

(c) See *Considerations*, page 17, 18.

demon-

demonstrably true, that could the same right Management that was the Cause of Success to the *Bristol* Scheme, be carried into the larger Districts, it would meet with the same Encouragement, and produce the same good Ends.

And from the ill Success of the Scheme in the Towns of *Sudbury* and *Calcester*, I argue, it will not from thence follow that a Parochial is better than a County Division for the Kingdom in general.

When he speaks of (d) Electioneering, the Means he proposes for preventing Idleness and Drunkenness among the lower People are most wild, and unlikely to succeed. He proposes, That, in all Boroughs, not having 200 Votes, the Freeholders of a County of 40 or 50 Pounds a Year should have a Right of voting: Which, says he, the small Boroughs would like; because it would bring much Company, and occasion the spending a great deal of Money. This Alteration, instead of lessening, seems rather calculated to introduce a greater Degree of Riot, Drunkenness, and Extravagance: For if a few Voters cannot be restrained from Intemperance, what Excesses might not be expected in those Boroughs, when such a Number of Freeholders of the County were let in upon them?

Whether such a Method would disfranchise a Borough or no, it is not material to enquire; certain it is, that it would injure the Burghers in a tender Point; because their Interests in the Privilege and Right of voting would be intirely swallowed up and lost, when it once came to be thus mixed and blended with a County, from what they now enjoy among themselves, within the Limits of their Borough.

(d) See *Considerations*, from page 20. to 23.

(e) The

(e) The Author also proposes some things for the Advantage of *Ireland*, in order thereby to gain over all who have that particular Interest at Heart, and enlarge his Party. To this End he takes up a Subject of a very popular Nature: With what Judgment and Candour he has treated it, the impartial Reader may judge by the following State of the Case.

It has been thought proper by the Legislature, in Consideration of its Importance to the Welfare of these Kingdoms, that *Great Britain* and *Ireland* should be prohibited from exporting their Wool to foreign Parts :

Also that a Duty should be paid upon the Import into *England* of all *Irish* Woollen and Bay Yarn; which has since been taken off by an Act of the 12th of his present Majesty; only under the Limitation of certain Ports for the Exportation from *Ireland*, and Importation into *England*.

(f) The Act above referred to is intitled, *An Act for taking off the Duties upon Woollen and Bay Yarn, imported from Ireland into England; and for the more effectual preventing the Exportation of Wool from Great Britain, and of Wool, and Wool manufactured, from Ireland to foreign Parts.*

By this Act it appears, That a very large Duty had been laid upon Woollen and Bay Yarn, imported into *England*, to which those Commodities were subject, according to the Book of Rates annexed to the Act of Tonage and Poundage, made in the 12th of *Charles II.*; and that several further Duties had been laid by subsequent Acts of Parlia-

(e) See *Considerations*, &c. from page 18. to 21.

(f) See *Statutes at large*, 12th of *George 2d*, cap. 21. 7th vol. page 280.

ment, which together were called the Old Subsidy, the One-third Subsidy, and the Two-thirds Subsidy; Part of which was granted for ever, subject to a Redemption by Parliament, and Part to his Majesty for Life. Notwithstanding this Appropriation, the Legislature had the Welfare of *Ireland* so much at heart, as to subject the Aggregate Fund, to make good what, on a Medium, for Seven Years then last past, should appear to have been the Amount of the said Duty, to his Majesty for Life, and to the several publick Creditors, or other Person or Persons, Bodies Politick or Corporate, having Interest or Securities in the Money arising by the said Duties.

And by the 5th Section of the said Act it is provided, That there is Liberty to export from *Ireland* for *England*, not only Wool, and Woollen and Bay Yarn, but also their Wool manufactured in all Shapes; viz. Wool-fells, Shortlings, Mortlings, Wool-flocks, Worsted-yarn, Cloth, Serge, Bays, Kerfies, Says, Frizes, Druggets, Cloth, Serges, Shalloons, Stuffs, and other Draperies, and Woollen Manufactures, or mixed with Wool or Wool-flocks.

Since the Enacting of which Law, I am informed by Persons acquainted with the Woollen Trade, that our Markets here have been as open for *Irish* as *English* Woollen Yarn; which is as much more for the Benefit of *Ireland* than exporting the Wool to *France*, as the Value of the preparing Wool for, and the Spinning; which employ many Thousands of Hands in that Country: The Truth of this Fact will appear upon the Bills of Entry at *Bristol*, and the several other Ports by Law appointed for Importation.

And

And I must beg Leave to observe further, That the Manufactures of the several Species in which the Woollen and Bay Yarn is wrought up, and for which *Ireland* receives at least 150,000 *l. per Ann.* would take a much larger Quantity, if they could or would send it.

Where then is the Necessity of burning, or throwing the *Irish* Wool into the Sea, when here is a Market for that, or (what is yet more advantageous to them) their Yarn; and upon Terms equal to that of our own Growth and Manufacture?

This being the true State of the Case, all he has advanced and concluded from thence, deserves but little Notice, as it tends only to inflame and create Jealousies and Suspicions in the Minds of the Subjects.

An Instance of which is very glaring and conspicuous (g) in the said Digression, where, after having supposed the People of *Ireland* prohibited from working up the Products of the Earth, and from selling them to their Neighbours; he cries out, "One would be apt to think, that a judicial Infatuation must attend a People who suffer such Tyranny and Folly to prevail together."

The Reader will excuse me, if I once more remind him, and press it upon his Attention, that the CONSIDERER's Scheme of providing for the Poor of a County in One Place, is a Scheme entirely his own; the Child of his own Imagination: No Proposals (as I know of) that have as yet appeared in Print, give any Countenance to the Supposition; and the Phantom seems raised only to frighten us from attempting the necessary Alteration.

(g) See *Considerations*, &c. page 19,

I have now gone through the several Passages in the *Considerations*, which seem more immediately to require Notice. I have impartially examined them, and as fully as the present Crisis will admit; these Subjects being at this Juncture under the Notice of Parliament. And it is incumbent on me, before I take Leave of that Pamphlet, to declare to the Publick, that these Annotations do not flow from any Prejudice or Malevolence to the Author, but spring purely from a Contrariety of Sentiments, and an honest Disapprobation of his Proposals and Principles. And the Reader will the more readily assent to this, when I declare further, that I am no less a Stranger to the Gentleman, whose Thoughts I have here taken the Freedom to examine, than to him whose deserving Performance demands so much of my Esteem.

From the frequent Occasions that have offered for citing and vindicating the *Remarks*, lest I should be thereby impeached of Partiality, or suspected to approve of every Part of his Scheme, and to close entirely with the Opinion of that Gentleman, it is necessary that I now point out the few Particulars wherein we differ, and assign the Reasons for that Difference. And these few Disagreements, being mixed in with many Parts that I approve of and commend, will necessarily oblige me, as they occur, to signify my Approbation of them.

The First material Objection I have to the RE-MARKER'S Scheme, is his Proposal of an (*b*) equal County-Rate; and in this he differs in Opinion from Sir *Josiah Child* and Mr. *Cary*, who think that

(*b*) See the *Remarks*, &c. page 45.

the Money should not be raised by equal Rate throughout the District; but should be charged on each Parish, in Proportion to what they paid before : And their Opinion is supported by this very good Reason, *Because all Parishes do not receive equal Advantage from this Scheme.* Admitting what the REMARKER says to have some Weight, that, the Poor being fluctuating, all Parishes may, at some time or other, be equally burdened, yet the imposing the equal County-Tax must bring along with it such disagreeable Alterations (which the Reader will best suggest), and to which the Landed Gentlemen would be particularly averse ; that, I am of Opinion, this very Clause would be sufficient to prevent the Success of any Bill.

Besides, such a Rate would throw the Burden entirely upon the Land, and free the Trading People, who at present are every-where subject, and in many Places are charged, and do pay, in proportion to their Stocks : Agreeable to the Opinion of Lord Chief Justice *Hale*, (*i*) that Stocks are as well by Law rateable as Lands, both to the Relief and raising a Stock for the Poor.

There is another Circumstance that has an unamiable Aspect, and seems to carry some Terror along with it ; and that is, the proposing (*k*) “ that “ Commissions should be yearly issued, under the “ Great Seal, to Persons of the first Rank and Eminence throughout the Kingdom to visit and inspect “ all the Houses in the several Districts.” Such a Circumstance, though intended to serve a good Pur-

(*i*) See Judge *Hale*, p. 120.

(*k*) See the *Remarks*, &c. page 50.

pose, might yet intimidate and discourage many from engaging in the Management, who would be otherwise both liberal Benefactors, and useful Members of the Corporation. The End for which this is proposed, might as fully, and much more agreeably, be answered, by laying an Account of the Proceedings in each District before the Quarter-Sessions, from them to be transmitted to Parliament.

The Bill likewise of 1747. stands liable to Objections; and it is apprehended the Reason why it did not pass the House of Lords, was, because the Guardians could have little Inducement to undertake the Charge, being appointed more on account of their Station and Fortune, than any pre-consulted Inclinations; notwithstanding they were (1) Persons the most eminent for Quality, Dignity, Office, and Estate, in each County.

Their *Numbers* likewise would most probably impede and clog the conducting these Affairs; it being a just Observation, that all Business is most effectually and expeditiously executed by a few well appointed Managers; and especially where they are prompted to it by voluntary Choice.

Neither is it surprising, that this Bill did not pass the House of Lords, when it so provided that there was but little Probability of any Benefactions to arise; the Benefactors being rated so high, and subject to the extravagant Contribution of 100*l.* *per Annum*. A discouraging Circumstance, when we consider the other Guardians, who, whether they had the Success of the Scheme at Heart, or not

(1) See Preface to the *Remarks*, &c. page vii.

were to have the Honour of being Guardians for Life, merely from their Eminence and Fortune, and subject to no Contribution. This was a Proposal very inconsistent with the (m) Preamble of his Bill ; in which he seems to have an Eye principally to the several Hospitals and Infirmaries of late established and maintained by voluntary Charities.

If, in the framing his Bill, he had a little more adopted the Plan of the said Hospitals, there would have been a greater Probability of Benefactions, by rendering the Conditions easier to the Contributors ; and would thereby have invited many into the Management who would be more likely to attend, and are more conversant in such Matters.

But still there would have been greater Probability, I conceive, of Benefits to have arisen from that Bill, had it been formed agreeable to the 1st, 2d, 4th, and 5th, (n) fundamental Points, agreed on by all the Schemes mentioned in the *Remarks* : preserving the Liberty of relieving or employing a poor Family, under their accidental and occasional Wants or Distresses ; suffering them, at the same time, to reside in their own Habitations ; (as has been before quoted from Sir *Josiah Child* and the REMARKER) : forming his Corporation on Mr. *Cary's* Schemes, which he seems best to approve of, and which are to be seen, page 47 : Admitting every Benefactor of some certain Sum, to be a Member of that Corporation for Life ; and every annual Benefactor of some certain Sum, to continue a Mem-

(m) See *Remarks*, &c. page 71.

(n) See the *Remarks*, page 34.

ber during the Continuance of such annual Contribution: Requiring no Oaths or Tests, nor any other Qualification of the Benefactor than the Subscription: And providing, that such as are to be the Representatives of the Parishes, be chosen, not necessarily by Freeholders only, but by Vestry; which Method will best suit the Parishes in and near the Metropolis: And I do not foresee, that any Disadvantage can arise from it to the more distant Parts.

And if the Gifts of the Benefactors were to be applied to the Use of their own Districts, it would be the Means of promoting more liberal Benefactions, than if those Gifts were to be paid into the Hands of the County-Treasurer, to be distributed at large throughout the County. I apprehend the Difference would be more than Ten to One; because every one will be glad to promote that particular Workhouse or Hospital, &c. in which the Poor of his own Parish and Neighbourhood are to be provided for, and which is to be governed and conducted by Persons of their own Acquaintance, and of whose Integrity, and prudent Management they have a good Opinion. Whereas, were their Donations to be distributed to the County at large, that Spirit of Liberality would be much checked and discouraged.

And the Reason of my Opinion is this; because I can assert from my own Knowledge, that many Benefactors to the Hospitals, which have been lately set on foot, and so happily succeeded (the *London*, the *Foundling*, *St. Luke's*, and the several others), have chearfully and largely contributed towards their Support, merely from a Persuasion of the right Application of their Gifts, and (satisfied with the
Opinion

Opinion they have entertained of those who have the Management) have never attended any of their Meetings, nor even once visited their Buildings.

(o) Consonant to this is the Opinion of Sir *Josiah Child*, who says, that "Three Fourths, at least, of the Stock must issue from the Charity of the People; as I doubt not but it will to a greater Proportion, if they be satisfied in the Managers thereof; but if otherwise, not the Fortieth; I might say, not the Hundredth Part."

Besides, a County-Distribution might be liable to Perversion, and tend to the Countenance and Support of bad Oeconomy in some Parts; for those Districts which are prudent in their Management, will necessarily be deprived of Part of their Share, which must go towards making up the Deficiency of other Districts, occasioned by their ill Management, and Want of Care.

Nor does it tend more to the Encouragement of ill Management, than to the damping of that Spirit of Emulation, which would be otherwise excited in the several Districts, who should succeed best.

The Objections I have here offered to some Part of the REMARKER's Scheme, are submitted to the Author himself, and the impartial Reader: They are only offered as the Reasons on which I ground my differing from him in Opinion, upon these particular Parts.

I would here beg Leave to suggest an Opinion, that it probably would be a Convenience to Pa-

(o) See Sir *Josiah Child*, page 100.

ishes, and an Advantage to the Poor, if it was permitted to such Parishes as should approve of it, that they might be impowered to appoint a Person to be Overseer, with a Salary annexed, to execute that Part of the Office which relates to the collecting the Money, and accounting for the same, giving sufficient Security; doing all the other Acts of that Office, except assessing and distributing the Money, and Maintenance of the Poor; the other Powers of the Office to centre in the Parish under the Direction of Vestry, or as the Parliament may otherwise think fit to appoint: By which means, instead of the Master, he would become the Servant to the Parish, and be thereby more under Controul; Monies would be better collected, and accounted for; those Inconveniencies which arise from the Inexperience of the Officers, avoided; and the Parishes would not be liable to suffer by Law-suits, without their Knowledge and Consent.

By which means also, if the Overseer, so appointed, upon his good Behaviour, is continued, he would grow every Year more and more conversant in his Duty: Whereas, as the Case now stands, the Overseer, before he comes to be acquainted with his Duty, is out of his Office.

With regard to the Expence it might occasion to the Parishes, in distant Parts, it would be very little; and though in the Suburbs of the Metropolis it would be greater, yet I apprehend it would be very readily borne; because, as the principal Reason for appointing the Overseers out of the Parishioners seems to have been, in order that they might all share in the Burden of the Office, they
would

would with Pleasure share in that Expence, which took off from them such a Burden.

The humane Reader will easily pardon me, if I here digress a little to speak of a common Evil, little known, and still less attended to.

It is a Complaint, and of a shocking Nature, that the Bodies of drowned Men are suffered to float up and down the River for many Days together ; and if they happen to ground on the Shore, they are permitted to lay there till the next Flood takes them off again : And if by Accident they remain there longer, to prevent a Nuisance, perhaps, a Hole is dug under Shore, and the emaciated Corpses are flung in.

To prevent this frequent Instance of Inhumanity, suppose the first Discoverer of such a Corpse should be intitled to some small Reward upon his bringing the Body to the nearest Shore, to be paid him by the Officers of the Parish, on giving Notice ; who should be obliged to give the best Description they can of the Body, in some publick Paper ; and if owned, the Body to be restored to their Friends, paying the Expences ; if not, to be buried in the said Parish Burial-Place.

This is inserted, only that the Case may be more publickly known ; and, if possible, some Remedy applied : Whether it is of such Importance, as to ask the Notice of the Legislature, must be submitted to their Wisdom.

But to resume the main Point :

If it is possible there should subsist a Project so wild (which has been already suggested, and spoken to) as to abolish all the Laws in being, relating to the Poor, and leave them to random Charity ; such

a Scheme is self-evidently contrary and opposite to every Scheme that would provide for the *better* Maintenance of the Poor.

It is so irrational, that it cannot be conceived to enter into the Mind of Man ! And how ridiculous the Absurdity, to think that taking away the insufficient Provision already established, can be a Means of promoting their Relief, and *adding* to their Maintenance !

Since the Order of the House of Commons, of the 17th of *December*, 1751. for the bringing in a Bill for the better Maintenance and Employment of poor Children, within that Part of *Great Britain* called *England* ; I have seen Sir *Richard Eloyd's* Proposal for the Employment of the Poor, and the Amendment of their Morals : Which I have very carefully and often examined ; and am convinced, that that Gentleman must have taken indefatigable Pains to enable himself to make so useful a Proposal. It seems extremely well calculated to serve the Purposes for which it is intended ; namely, the preserving the rising Generation from the Vices and Corruptions so glaring and notorious in the lower People. It will undoubtedly, in time, effectually heal these Disorders, and raise up a Set of People inured to Industry, and unacquainted with Debauchery. But as this is a distant Prospect ; it is to be wished, That a Gentleman, whose Zeal is so warm for the Relief and Employ of the Poor, and whose Abilities to point out and propose the Methods necessary to the accomplishing those Ends, are so eminent and well known ; it is to be wished, I say, that a Gentleman so distinguished would strike out a more extensive Scheme ; to re-
claim,

claim, if possible, the present Race, and, by some salutary Methods, remove every Temptation from the Poor of becoming either mischievous, or even useless Members of the Community.

And it is not to be doubted but the Legislature will give all Assistance and Encouragement to the accomplishing this good End: Especially when it is considered, that HIS MAJESTY, at the Opening the last Sessions of Parliament, in 1750. very earnestly recommends to the Parliament, the suppressing those Outrages and Violences, which are inconsistent with all good Order and Government, and endanger the Lives and Properties of his Subjects.

And, besides, the same ROYAL Care was still more strongly expressed at the Opening of the present Sessions by his MAJESTY, in recommending "in the most earnest Manner, to consider seriously of some effectual Provisions to suppress those audacious Crimes of Robbery and Violence, which are now become so frequent, especially about this great Capital; and which have proceeded, in a great measure, from that profligate Spirit of Irreligion, Idleness, Gaming, and Extravagance, which has of late extended itself in an uncommon Degree."

And it is self-evident, that there is nothing can effectually cure and prevent these Outrages, but the making a competent Provision for the Maintenance and Employ of the Poor.

After this, I suppose, nothing can be further required to prompt Gentlemen to the taking these momentous and necessary Subjects into their most serious Considerations: Of such Moment are they,
in

is the Opinion of that great and judicious Man Sir
Josiah Child, that (p) he says, " if a whole Sessions
 " of Parliament were employed on this singular
 " Concern, I think, it would be time spent as
 " much to the Glory of God, and Good of this
 " Nation, as in any thing that noble and worthy
 " Patriots can be employed in."

(p) See Sir *Josiah Child*'s Discourse, page 89.

F I N I S.



